

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, in order to prevent taxpayers' hard-earned dollars from being wasted on this type of information from my FBI background check, I thought I would voluntarily hand this over to the White House. By giving this to the White House, they would be able to save time and money on helping us to save to balance the budget.

I would like to point out to this Chamber that valuable taxpayer money has been wasted time and time again by this White House on politically motivated shenanigans such as these FBI files, their travel office and helicopter follies to golf courses by White House personnel.

Mr. Speaker, these problems will continue to happen. I urge my colleagues and the American people to realize that this abuse of our Government by this administration and their liberal buddies is not the first, nor will it be the last.

REPUBLICANS MORE INTERESTED IN REDUCING TAXES FOR THE WEALTHY THAN REDUCING THE DEFICIT

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the cat is out of the bag. The radical Republican extremists are not in favor of reducing the deficits. They do want a tax cut, a massive tax cut, for the wealthy. We saw it last night.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues listened to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], he never once in this closing argument for that budget, never once, mentioned the word "deficit." In fact, under their budget, the reason he did not, under their budget next year the deficit goes up; the following year, the deficit goes up. It does not go down. They need to do that in order to give tax cuts for the wealthy.

The spending cut for Medicare; where is that going to go? The spending cuts for food stamps; where is that going to go? Tax cuts for the wealthy, not to reduce the deficit, because the deficit is going to go up.

Mr. Speaker, they are more interested in reducing taxes for wealthy than they are in reducing the deficits. I say let us reduce the deficits before we give any tax cuts for anybody. That is my position. Let us get a balanced budget first. Then we reduce the deficits.

BROKEN ARMS AND BROKEN PROMISES

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, late last night the House passed the 1997 budget,

after an intense battle. The Republican leadership spent an entire day twisting arms to get the votes they needed. The result: A House Chamber filled with broken arms and, most important, broken promises.

Some freshman Republicans who came to Washington to balance the budget ended up voting to actually increase the deficit. Two in particular, Representatives COOLEY and CUBIN, actually voted "no" on passing the budget and then switched their votes. They were joined by two other switchers, Representatives ALLARD and METCALF. Clearly there was a lot of pressure in this Chamber yesterday.

Pressure to approve a budget that increases the deficit, cuts the Medicare Program by \$168 billion over a 6-year period to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy, limits student loans, taxes working families, and closes rural hospitals.

Now the drama of the budget battle is over and the Republican leadership has made one thing explicitly clear: Promises can be made and promises can be broken.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is it within the rules of the House for Members to ascribe motivation to other Members and identify them by name?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Political motivations can be suggested, but not personal motivations.

Mr. WALKER. And the use of names is an appropriate kind of behavior on the House floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is nothing per se a violation by using another Member's name in describing a political action or motive. However, tradition has been to refer to Members by the State of origin rather than by personal names.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Montana will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, is it within the rules of the House for Members during 1-minutes to question the motivation of the President?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, in debate it would be allowable to question political motivation. What the gentleman raised as a parliamentary inquiry was on personal motivation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, is it within the rules for a Member of the House during 1-minutes, or at any other time, to question whether or not a President is acting within the law in his own or her own personal activities?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not make a judgment on what the charges may be or the moti-

vations behind that, but the Members should refrain from personalities in debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would encourage that as well.

WHAT IF A REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT WERE ACCUSED OF RAIDING FBI FILES?

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, the other day in the Washington Post, Mary McGrory brought up a point about the Filegate controversy that I thought was very relevant. What if this had been a Republican administration? Think about it, Mr. Speaker; every member of the liberal media would be at their wits end. CNN would have special Filegate music and would break in every 10 minutes with a special report. Dan Rather and Peter Jennings would be breathless in their zeal to find out the truth about what was going on in the White House.

"60 Minutes" and "20/20" would do special interviews with the people whose FBI files were investigated. They would ask sensitive questions like, "How does it feel to have your FBI file looked into by the White House?"

But this is not what is happening, Mr. Speaker. Of course, there is media coverage of Filegate, I do not deny that. But there is a different standard applied to liberal Democrats by the media. If a Republican President were accused of raiding FBI files of Democrats, the liberal media would be in absolutely apoplexy.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN CHURCHES UNDER SIEGE IN AMERICA

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the 1960's, as the civil rights journey, bloody though it might have been, unfolded in this Nation the eyes of most of America were riveted on those who were seeking simply freedom. Today we are under siege as the most recent church burned in Enid, OK. African-American churches across this Nation are under siege through the tragedy of church burnings. Some of my colleagues have disdained to call this political. I cry out in outrage.

As a cosponsor of the Church Arson Prevention Act, I asked the Speaker of the House in posthaste to bring this to the floor. In joining the gentlewoman from North Carolina who sponsored a resolution for this Nation to denounce this tragedy, I asked for its immediate attention in this House, and I ask America not to sleep at night while these tragedies are occurring, for I ask whether or not our colleagues are willing to entertain the possible loss of

life. I ask America to have a day of prayer this coming Sunday to join for peace and freedom and the end of racial hostilities and this tragedy and blight on the Constitution of the United States of America.

BART SIMPSON AND THE WHITE HOUSE: "I DIDN'T DO IT"

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, Bart Simpson said, "I didn't do it, nobody saw me, you can't prove anything."

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are hearing out of the White House when it comes to the files that were requested from the FBI: I did not do it. Bernard Nussbaum says, and he was White House counsel, he says he did not request these FBI files; yet 341 of them were sent to the White House on a letter with his name on it: Nobody saw me. The President says he did not read the files.

But that is kind of what the gentleman from Texas, DICK ARMEY, said: "That is like the President saying he did not inhale."

You can't prove anything. That is because the White House is withholding 2,000 pages of information related to Travelgate documents, which is what spurred the request for the FBI files to begin with.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the White House to come clean about Travelgate and about Filegate because the American people deserve to know the truth about what is going on within those walls.

TIME FOR THE WHITE HOUSE TO COME CLEAN ON THE FBI FILE SEARCH

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] talks about the Nixon White House, because as far as the latest White House blunder the President's silence has been almost deafening. The unanswered questions keep piling up, and the President still has not taken responsibility. What was the White House doing with over 340 private citizens' FBI files? How did these files just happen to be of members of the former Bush and Reagan administration? And why is the President not taking responsibility for these actions?

Mr. Speaker, once again we have a case of feigned innocence by higher-ups at the White House, but this is one time too many that lower level staffers have had to take the blame for major mixups. The excuses are running thin, the coverup game has gone on a little too long. It is time for the White House and the President to come clean about

the FBI search. The American people demand no less.

CONCERN ABOUT REPUBLICAN BUDGET PRIORITIES

(Mr. WARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to state that the President of the United States did apologize yesterday, and I think it is very important to have that on the record.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern over the majority's priorities. Last night the budget resolution was passed by a slim margin, changing Medicare in ways that will hurt our working families, raising tax on our working families and limiting direct student loans.

□ 1030

Today I hear that Medicaid is on the chopping block in the Committee on Commerce. I have one question to ask my colleague on the other side of the aisle: How far will you go, attacking the elderly, the poor, our children, and the disabled?

Completely repealing the Medicaid Program will mean that 18 million children will lose their health coverage if we turn what is now a responsibility and commitment on the part of the Federal Government into a State block-granted program. Four million seniors and disabled will lose their guaranteed coverage needed for doctor and hospital care. I ask, when will this stop?

AN APOLOGY BY THE PRESIDENT IS NOT ENOUGH

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Colorado suggested an apology from the President of the United States is enough; enough, when 340 people have had their lives stripped bare for purely political reasons, their FBI files open for purely political reasons, and an apology is enough.

Mr. Speaker, that is not enough, particularly when we have an FBI official today who tells us about the situation as it may relate to the Nixon administration. He says, "Some Presidents have made good use of FBI background investigations and some, to their regret, have not. But never before has any administration used background investigations of another President's political staff. FBI employees knew it would be wrong to give raw FBI files on political opponents to the other party. In fact, they knew it would be illegal, each disclosure a violation of the Federal Privacy Act."

We are talking about a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker. It deserves full investigation. I am shocked to hear Democrats who came to this floor, time and time again, telling us how Reagan administration officials should be investigated, Bush administration officials should be investigated, how telling us that an apology by the President is enough.

STUPID IS AS STUPID DOES

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1981, President Reagan convinced Congress to increase military spending and cut taxes for the wealthy, claiming this would balance the budget by 1983. Well, 1983 came along and our deficit exploded to \$207 billion in just the first 2 years of the Reagan administration.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, Republican leaders did the exact same thing. The Republican budget resolution passed last night actually increases the deficit by \$40 billion over the next 2 years, just to pay for—you guessed it—tax breaks and star wars.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, Republican leaders shut down the Government twice just so they could increase the deficit by \$40 billion, leaving real deficit reduction to future congresses.

As Forrest Gump said, Mr. Speaker, "stupid is, as stupid does."

THE LIBERAL DEMOCRATS IN THIS HOUSE WERE RESPONSIBLE FOR OUR HUGE DEFICITS, NOT THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the comments of the gentlewoman who just spoke. The Reagan administration was not responsible for those huge deficits. It was this House, the liberal Democrats in this House, who repeatedly served up to that President increasing levels of spending, the creation of new programs and new departments, which President Reagan repeatedly vetoed those appropriations bills, and it resulted in the Government being closed down. Yes; the Government was closed down 17 times during the Reagan and Bush administrations. Why? Because the liberal Democrats in the House wanted to spend more money.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time, we have a House of Representatives that wants to spend less and a liberal Democrat President in the White House who is closing down the Government with his vetoes because he wants to spend more money. We need to set the record straight for the American people. Those deficits that were created in the 1980's were created while Federal revenues to the Treasury increased \$600 billion. It is because this House of Representatives spent \$800 billion more